

CLEMENT SETH ROBERTS (SBN 209203)  
croberts@orrick.com  
BAS DE BLANK (SBN 191487)  
basdeblank@orrick.com  
ALYSSA CARIDIS (SBN 260103)  
acaridis@orrick.com  
ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
The Orrick Building  
405 Howard Street  
San Francisco, CA 94105-2669  
Telephone: +1 415 773 5700  
Facsimile: +1 415 773 5759

SEAN M. SULLIVAN (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
sullivan@ls3ip.com  
COLE RICHTER (admitted *pro hac vice*)  
richter@ls3ip.com  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP  
656 W Randolph St., Floor 5W  
Chicago, IL 60661  
Telephone: +1 312 754 0002  
Facsimile: +1 312 754 0003

*Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA,  
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

GOOGLE LLC,  
Plaintiff and Counter-defendant,  
v.  
SONOS, INC.,  
Defendant and Counter-claimant.

Case No. 3:20-cv-06754-WHA  
Related to Case No. 3:21-cv-07559-WHA

**SONOS, INC.'S ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION TO FILE UNDER SEAL RE  
JOINT DISCOVERY LETTER BRIEF**

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to Civil Local Rules 7-11 and 79-5, Sonos, Inc. (“Sonos”) hereby respectfully submits this Administrative Motion to Seal (“Administrative Motion”) in connection with Sonos, Inc.’s and Google LLC’s (“Google”) Joint Discovery Letter Brief (“Joint Discovery Letter Brief”). Specifically, Sonos seeks to file under seal the information and/or document(s) listed below:

DOCUMENT	PORTIONS TO BE SEALED	DESIGNATING PARTY
Joint Discovery Letter Brief	Portions highlighted in blue	Sonos
Joint Discovery Letter Brief	Portions highlighted in yellow	Sonos and Google
Exhibit 1 to Joint Discovery Letter Brief	Portions highlighted in blue	Sonos
Exhibit 1 to Joint Discovery Letter Brief	Portions highlighted in yellow	Sonos and Google

## II. LEGAL STANDARD

Civil Local Rule 79-5 requires that a party seeking sealing “establish[] that the document, or portions thereof, are privileged, protectable as a trade secret or otherwise entitled to protection under the law” (*i.e.*, is “sealable”). *See* Civil L.R. 79-5(b). The sealing request must also “be narrowly tailored to seek sealing only of sealable material.” *Id.*

“Historically, courts have recognized a ‘general right to inspect and copy public records and documents, including judicial records and documents.’” *Kamakana v. City & Cty. of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1178 (9th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Nixon v. Warner Commc’ns, Inc.*, 435 U.S. 589, 597 & n.7 (1978)). Accordingly, when considering a sealing request, “a ‘strong presumption in favor of access’ is the starting point.” *Id.* (quoting *Foltz v. State Farm Mutual Auto. Insurance Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th Cir. 2003)).

The Ninth Circuit has recognized that two different standards may apply to a request to seal a document – namely the “compelling reasons” standard or the “good cause” standard. *Blessing v. Plex Sys., Inc.*, No. 21-CV-05951-PJH, 2021 WL 6064006, at \*12 (N.D. Cal. Dec. 22, 2021) (citing *Ctr. for Auto Safety v. Chrysler Grp., LLC*, 809 F.3d 1092, 1096-97 (9th Cir.

2016)). The compelling reasons standard applies to any sealing request made in connection with a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of a case.” *Id.* A party seeking to seal materials submitted with a motion that is “more than tangentially related to the merits of the case” must demonstrate that there are “compelling reasons” to keep the documents under seal. *WhatsApp Inc. v. NSO Grp. Techs. Ltd.*, 491 F. Supp. 3d 584, 596 (N.D. Cal. 2020) (citing *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F. 3d at 1101-1102). What constitutes a compelling reason is left to the “sound discretion of the trial court.” *Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097 (quoting *Nixon*, 435 U.S. at 599).

Under the compelling reasons standard, “a court may seal a record only if it finds a ‘compelling reason’ to support such treatment.” *Blessing*, 2021 WL 6064006, at \*12. In applying the “compelling reasons” standard, the Ninth Circuit has found appropriate the sealing of documents where court records could be used “as sources of business information that might harm a litigant’s competitive standing.” *See Ctr. for Auto Safety*, 809 F.3d at 1097. “Confidential business information in the form of ‘license agreements, financial terms, details of confidential licensing negotiations, and business strategies’ satisfies the ‘compelling reasons’ standard.” *Hetland v. LendingTree, LLC*, No. 19-CV-02288-JSC, 2021 WL 2313386, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. May 3, 2021) (quoting *Exeltis USA Inc. v. First Databank, Inc.*, Case No. 17-cv-04810-HSG, 2020 WL 2838812, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. June 1, 2020)).

### III. THE COURT SHOULD SEAL SONOS’S CONFIDENTIAL MATERIAL

The portions of the Joint Discovery Letter Brief and Exhibit 1 highlighted in blue and yellow contain references to Sonos’s confidential business information and trade secrets, including Sonos’s research and development processes. The specifics of how these functionalities and processes operate is confidential information that Sonos does not share publicly. Thus, public disclosure of such information may lead to competitive harm as Sonos’s competitors could use these details regarding the architecture and functionality of these products to gain a competitive advantage in the marketplace with respect to their competing products. Additionally, some of the yellow highlighted portions include terms to confidential agreements that are not public. Disclosure of this information would harm Sonos’s competitive standing by

1 giving Sonos's competitors highly sensitive information about Sonos's business dealings with  
2 other entities. A less restrictive alternative than sealing the portions of the Joint Discovery Letter  
3 Brief and Exhibit 1, as indicated in the table above, would not be sufficient because the  
4 information sought to be sealed is Sonos's confidential business information and trade secrets and  
5 is integral to Sonos's legal arguments. *See* Declaration of Clem Roberts in Support of  
6 Administrative Motion filed concurrently herewith, ¶ 4.

#### 7 **IV. CONCLUSION**

8 In compliance with Civil Local Rule 79-5(d) and (e), unredacted versions of the above-  
9 listed documents accompany this Administrative Motion and redacted versions are filed publicly.  
10 A proposed order is being filed concurrently herewith. For the foregoing reasons, Sonos  
11 respectfully requests that the Court grant Sonos's Administrative Motion.

12  
13 Dated: January 23, 2023

ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
and  
LEE SULLIVAN SHEA & SMITH LLP

14  
15 By: /s/ Clement S. Roberts  
16 Clement S. Roberts

17 *Attorneys for Sonos, Inc.*  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28